

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,808	08/25/2003	Jongyoon Han	SD-8401.1	1313
51917 . 75	90 11/07/2006		EXAMINER	
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL (SNL)			NOGUEROLA, ALEXANDER STEPHAN	
1850 M STREE # 800	T, NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON	N, DC 20036		1753	
		•	DATE MAILED: 11/07/2000	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/646,808	HAN ET AL.	•
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit	
		ALEX NOGUEROLA	1753	
•	- The MAILING DATE of this communica	tion appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address	
Period fo				•
WHIC - Extendafter: - If NO - Failur Any re	PRIENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL sions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, eply received by the Office later than three months after ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a recation. bry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. Exply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	.
Status				٠.
1)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on .		;
, —	•	☐ This action is non-final.		
,	Since this application is in condition for		ers, prosecution as to the merits	is F
,	closed in accordance with the practice	under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	·
Dianasiti	on of Claima			
<u> </u>	on of Claims	organiamon No.	The part mills of	
• —	Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are pending in the app			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are v	withdrawn from consideration.	. ~	•
• —	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
7)[J	Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to	The second of the second of the second		
8,1	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or election requirement		
٠	LI PERIOD FOR	金融 的复数多数		
Applicati	on Papers	MANAGEMENT TO THE STATE OF THE		
9) 🗌 -	The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.		
10)🖾 ີ	The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 August 2003</u>	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ ob	ected to by the Examiner.	· ·
	Applicant may not request that any objectio	n to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	:
State	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	e correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121	(d).
11) 🔲 🧻	The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. 6 119	The Constitution of the Co	•	
- 1	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. &	em proseculio ^{le} as a los paeras. 119(a) ₂ (d) or (f)	
_	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	loreign priority under 35 0.5.0. §	119(a)-(d) 01 (1).	ı
ajı	1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority do	cuments have been received.		
•		cuments have been received in Ap	oplication No.	·. \$
	3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of t			
	application from the International	• • • • • •		
* .S	ee the attached detailed Office action for	or a list of the certified copies not i	received.	•
. •	reconstruction of the second			·
			·*	:
Adda a ba		•		
	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date	÷
3) Infom	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	is/dire with a soe 5)	formal Patent Application miner	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

" of his and

The Park

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The mediane restorate updates and in the latest continues.

2. Claims 1, 2, 8, 16, 25, 33, 35, and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Sanders et al. WO 02/48177 A10 ("Sanders").

Sanders discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device (16), for isoelectric manufactured or described in a printed public disconnection of a fluid sample, focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See

The United Stones is hits the invention by the applicant for patention (2) a patent of Causan on the application and the first two transfers of the patent o

the except that an internal orbit application field and element of the application of the

a theoret application designate from the common community of the action of those stime 27 and

The control application designal.

the abstract and page 05, lines 04-24. Note that claims 1 and 2 do not actually require polyacrylamide gel only that the device be capable of holding such a gel, which the device of Sanders is since the microchannel contains a separation gel throughout its length. Note also the disclosure of SDS on page 6, first full paragraph. For claim 16 note that a loading structure is implied by page 05, lines 25-26, which discloses introducing sample into the end of the focusing section 14. For claim 33 also see page 01: 01-06. For claim 35 also see the abstract and page 05, line 25 – page 06, line 06. For claims 38 and 40 also see page 06, lines 08-15. For claim 39 also see page 05, lines 26-27, which discloses introducing sample in the end of the focusing section.

..., 30, lines 04-24. Nute that claims 1 and 1 its cally require

all mi, that the parties of expable of holding guents out which has

3. Claims 1, 2, 8, 16-18, 25, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Wiktorowicz et al. (US 6,214,191 B1) ('Wiktorowicz").

Addressing claims 1 and 25, Wiktorowicz discloses a multidimensional and a structure is implied by page 95, lines who whom discloses electrophoresis device (100), for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gelectrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figure 4; col. 06: 27-38; for this see that the color of t

Addressing claims 2 and 8, for the additional limitation of this claim see col. 16:24-39; and col. 13:66 – col. 14:24.

muse and Wilktorowich et al. 供意意は行って (1)代告 いいっこ

A state of the sta

t 10-18, 2t all it we specified throat the

,

Art Unit: 1753

Addressing claims 16 and 17, for the additional limitations of these claims see col. 07:25-30 and Figure 4.33

Addressing claim 18, for the additional limitation of this claim note channel 160 in Figure 4.

Addressing claim 33, for the additional limitation of this claim see the abstract.

antenber: 10/0 /2 lb 5

4. Claims 1, 2, 8, 12, 16-22, 25, and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Manz et al. (US 5,599,432) ("Manz").

Addressing claims 1 and 25, Manz discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis chain 18, for the additional limetrom this contained than electrophoresis device (Figure 1), for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figure 1; col. 05:55-59; col. 05:13-27; have a property of the first o

Addressing claims 2 and 8, for the additional limitation of this claim see col. 03:18-24; col. 09:33-55; and col. 02:06-36.

12 (16-22, 25, and 36-40 are rejected units) 17 1 (2. 102(p) 5):

1997-1997 ("Manz")

in income de la company de la popular de la popular de la perelactrophorasis.

and of the control control control of the transfer of the phases of

if it sample, comparing at least one micromore

मापु व लापुरा

Art Unit: 1753

Addressing claim 12, for the additional limitation of this claim see claim 11 of Manz.

Addressing claims 16 and 17, for the additional limitations of these claims see col.07:09-12 and Figure 1. Note that inlet 1 is in fluid communication with several microchanels and is thus shared with at two microchannels.

Addressing claim 18, for the additional limitation of this claim note left channel "1" in Figure 1.

Caith in follows have the application of a problem, see claim of the

Addressing claims 19 and 20, for the additional limitations of these claims note channel "21" in Figure 1. Note that claim 20 does not actually require one of the listed materials.

bin shared with at two microchannels.

Addressing claim 21, for the additional limitation of this claim note right channel "1" in Figure 1.

ello e sela il dame 18 dei mere in cega bermanon de Tino Cione no e lett channel "fe"

what is the firment. Mote more from 20 does not actually require one of the listed

Addressing claim 22, for the additional limitation of this claim note injection device "3" in Figure 1 and see col. 06:61-66 and col. 07:13-30. Note that claim 22 does not require the step of processing the sample.

Addressing claims 38 and 40, for the additional limitations of these claims see col. 02:06-36, note SDS.

Addressing claim 39, for the additional limitation of this claim see col. 07:30-37.

thann 22, for the additional to its time of the men in aute injustice

5. Claims 1-5, 8, 12, 16-27, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Lee et al. (US 6,974,526 B2) ("Lee").

Addressing claims 1 and 25, Lee discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device, for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figures 2-9; col. 05:26-30; col. 01:25-37; col. 05:46-49; and col. 12:13-19.

Comment of the 12, 16-27 non-the rejected factor to the Comment of the Original Nation.

Addressing claims 2 and 8, for the additional limitation of this claim see col. 03:08-13.

4. Lee et al. (US 6,974 526 B2,755 - 1

france is the contract of the

:1.

Addressing claims 3-5, for the additional limitations of these claims see col. 05:17-30.

Addressing claim 12, for the additional limitation of this claim see col. 08:05-19.

Addressing claims 16 and 17, for the additional limitations of these claims see col. 04:48-51 and Figures 1-10.

Addressing claim 18, for the additional limitation of this claim note channel 3 in Figures 2-9.

Addressing claims 19 and 20, for the additional limitations of these claims see col. 06:07-11.

Agricus : Mill 12 ford - Homenam minanon or line chim . Or Co of 19

Addressing claim 21, for the additional limitation of this claim note the embodiments in Figures 8 and 10 in which channels "4" and "11" are grouped in threes or fours. One of each group of three or four channels can be construed as a bypass channel for the other channels in the group.

Addressing claim 23, for the additional limitation of this claim see col. 06:07-12.

reduce the countries of the control of the administrations of clean damps to a

Addressing claims 24 and 26, for the additional limitations of this claims see col. 02:20-33 and col. 07:52-65.

Addressing claim 27, for the additional limitation of this claim note that the membrane is a polymeric strip that lies across the underlying channels. See Figure 10.

If pressure were applied to the membrane it would any channels under the region in which pressure was applied.

Addressing claim 33, for the additional limitations of this claims see the abstract.

their size of the first radictional limitations of the chains see

artic stupit units autoss the underlying channels. See Figure 19.

and the fell to the state of the

Addressing claims 38-40, for the additional limitations of these claims see col. 05:45-49 and col. 06:13-20.

Suber 16 as

· · · · · · · · · · · · ied

1467 - 15015-20

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1753

- 7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 2103(a) are sure currents at issue

9. Claims 3-7 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanders et al. WO 02/48177 A10 ("Sanders").

in a mig objects. The prepart in the application indicating

is somethe level of ordinary skill at the position in

Addressing claims 3-7, Sanders discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device (16), for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract and page 05, lines 04-24. Note that claims 1

Art Unit: 1753

and 2 do not actually require polyacrylamide gel only that the device be capable of holding such a gel, which the device of Sanders is since the microchannel contains a separation gel throughout its length. Note also the disclosure of SDS on page 6., first full paragraph.

Sanders does not mention having the length be within the claimed ranges; however, Sanders does disclose having the device be only 20 mm x 40 mm and that the microchannel may be straight or curved. See page 10, lines 16-19 and page 03, lines 23-24. Thus, barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the claimed length ranges care Ceither arbitrary, or just a matter of optimizing the microchannel length for improved separation to provide a smaller pH gradient, that is many isoelectric sections, or to increase the separation path for the gel electrophoresis, which will improve the resolution of the sample components.

Addressing claims 28-32, Sanders does not mention the time for performing IEF, SDS-PAGE, or native PAGE, although Sanders does disclose measuring analyte velocity. See page 09, second full paragraph. However, barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the time for performing one of these separations will depend on the desired resolution and separation conditions optimized for this resolution. For example, it was known in the art that the higher the electrophoresis voltage the quicker the separation, however, resolution would be adversely affected at higher voltages because of Joule heating. Also, a shorter microchannel lengths will

reduce the separation time however the separation resolution will not be as great as for longer microchannels, other things being equal.

10. Claims 3-7, 28-33, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiktorowicz et al. (US 6,214,191 B1) ('Wiktorowicz").

Addressing claims 3-7, Wiktorowicz discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device (100), for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figure 4; col. 06: 27-38; col. 07:25-30; col. 07:63-67; col. 09:58 – col. 10:08; and col. 13:66 – col. 14:34.

Wiktorowicz does not mention the claimed length ranges; however, Wiktorowicz does disclose that the separation cavity length may be 1 to 20 centimeters, which overlaps or has a shared end point with at least the ranges of claims 3-5. See col. 08:06-29. Since Wiktorowicz also discloses that the channel widths may be only 0.25mm, barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the claimed length ranges are either arbitrary, or just a matter of optimizing the microchannel length for improved separation to provide a smaller pH gradient, that is many isoelectric sections, or to increase the separation path for the gel electrophoresis, which will improve the resolution of the sample components.

end during the the separation can progettimay but for the party less wings

tion and a little a shared end notativith of tempoles larged at a second 3.5 time-cold.

Lavera with the state of the first the about the profile and because it

and register much a service of the service

Art Unit: 1753

Addressing claims 28-32, Wiktorowicz does not mention the time for performing IEF, SDS-PAGE, or native PAGE. However, barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the time for performing one of these separations will depend on the desired resolution and separation conditions optimized for this resolution. For example, it was known in the art that the higher the electrophoresis voltage the quicker the separation, however, resolution would be adversely affected at higher voltages because of Joule heating. Also, a shorter microchannel lengths will reduce the separation time however the separation resolution will not be as great as for longer microchannels, other things being equal.

Addressing claim 33, Wiktorowicz does not mention a sample comprising protein; however, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the device with a sample comprising at least one protein because Wiktorowicz discloses isoelectric focusing is commonly used for protein separations.

Addressing claims 35, Wiktorowicz discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device (100), for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figure 4; col. 06: 27-38; col. 07:25-30; col. 07:63-67; col. 09:58 – col. 10:08; and col. 13:66 – col. 14:34.

Add to see thin, 33, was now to admission are also mention are ample comprising proteins

Art Unit: 1753

Wiktorowicz clearly intends for the device to be used. See the abstract and col. 04:03-25 and col. 12:10-16.

11. Claims 3-7, 28-32, 34, 35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manz et al. (US 5,599,432) ("Manz").

Addressing claims 3-7, Manz discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device (Figure 1), for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figure 1; col. 05:55-59; col. 05:13-27; col. 07:66 – col. 08:12; col. 09:33-54; col. 03:18-23; and col. 02:06-36.

Manz does not mention the claimed length ranges; however, Manz discloses that the channel widths may be only 1 micron wide. See col. 05:55-58. So barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the claimed length ranges are either arbitrary, or just a matter of optimizing the microchannel length for improved separation to provide a smaller pH gradient, that is many isoelectric sections, or to increase the separation path for the gel's electrophoresis, which will improve the resolution of the sample components.

east a solar and a chalerial. See the absolute figure 1 or Late Co. 1997 1997

10 12; col. 09:33-54; col. 03:18-20: and rol. 02:03:48

and the second of the second o

iter to the menger of the all languages by the Monz dischoras

muchase to the authorized such as the obsted results, the course of mages of

and the state of an experience of an experience of an experience of the state of an experience of the state of an experience of the state of the sta

en de la companya de la co

Art Unit: 1753

Addressing claims 28-32, Manz does not mention the time for performing IEF, SDS-PAGE, or native PAGE, although Manz notes that capillary electrophoresis can be performed under one minute in microchips. See col. 02:61-66. However, barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the time for performing one of these separations will depend on the desired resolution and separation conditions optimized for this resolution. For example, it was known in the art that the higher the electrophoresis voltage the quicker the separation, however, resolution would be adversely affected at higher voltages because of Joule heating. Also, a shorter microchannel lengths will reduce the separation time however the separation resolution will not be as great as for longer microchannels, other things being equal.

The PAGE, although Manz noted that rapillars in the Wallesis best to

Addressing claim 34, Manz discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device (Figure 1), for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figure 1; col. 05:55-59; col. 05:13-27; col. 07:66 – col. 08:12; col. 09:33-54; col. 03:18-23; and col. 02:06-36.

Unio 2007 the office of months to the office of the in-

Manz also discloses conducting IEF in at least one horizontal channel 3 – Figure 6) between two electrodes (in reservoirs 5 and 6) and SDS-PAGE or PAGE in at least one vertical channel (11) between two pairs of electrodes (in reservoirs 35 and 37), wherein one pair of the electrodes is placed above the two electrodes of the horizontal microchannel and the other pair of electrodes is placed below the two electrodes

The following a few transport of the wing a few Miles

From isoelectric focusing (IEF) or with acrylander and disctrophological

Address Jaim 34, Mai zahres sika multidi hebbig.

Art Unit: 1753

(Figure 6). See also col. 05:61 – col. 06:04 and col. 10:44-49. Manz does not mention conducting IEF when the electrodes on the right side are of one voltage and the electrodes on the left side are of another voltage preventing the fluid sample from migrating through the vertical microchannel. However, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so because this will allow the sample to undergo complete IEF separation before undergoing PAGE. If the two pairs of electrodes were at voltages that allowed migration through a vertical channel then sample components focused along the IEF channel at the intersections with the vertical channel would be separated in the vertical channel before the sample was completely separated by IEF. This may adversely affect the electrical field along the IEF channel because of competing fields and changing ionic strength in the vertical channel.

Addressing claims 35 and 37, Manz discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device (Figure 1), for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figure 1; col. 05:55-59; col. 05:13-27; col. 07:66 – col. 08:12; col. 09:33-54; col. 03:18-23; and col. 02:06-36.

and the control of the state of

Manz clearly intends for the device to be used. See the abstract and col. 03:25-57.

i, and it is a manifest of companies leader and changing round changing in the Vertical

Art Unit: 1753

12. Claims 6, 7, 28-32, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US 6,974,526 B2) ("Lee").

Addressing claims 6 and 7, Lee discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device, for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figures 2-9; col. 05:26-30; col. 01:25-37; col. 05:46-49; and col. 12:13-19.

Lee does not mention the claimed length ranges; however, Lee discloses that the channel widths may be only 5 microns wide and "The microchannels (e.g. 3, 4) can be nay suitable length." See col. 05:17-30. So barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the claimed length ranges are either arbitrary, or just a matter of optimizing the microchannel length for improved separation to provide a smaller pH gradient, that is many isoelectric sections, or to increase the separation path for the gel electrophoresis, which will improve the resolution of the sample components.

Addressing claims 28-32, Lee does not mention the time for performing IEF, SDS-PAGE, or native PAGE. See col. 02:61-66. However, barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the time for performing one of these separations will depend on the desired resolution and separation conditions optimized for this resolution. For example, it was known in the art that the higher the electrophoresis voltage the quicker the separation, however, resolution would be adversely affected at higher voltages because of Joule heating. Also, a shorter microchannel lengths will

file of the service of the resist value. When the he resolution of the components

Art Unit: 1753

reduce the separation time however the separation resolution will not be as great as for longer microchannels, other things being equal.

Addressing claims 35 and 36, Lee discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device, for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figures 2-9; col. 05:26-30; col. 01:25-37; col. 05:46-49; and col. 12:13-19. Lee also discloses having the polymeric membrane be placed on top of the microchannel. See col. 02:20-33 and col. 07:52-65.

Lee clearly intends for the device to be used. See the abstract and col. 02:01 – 03:20:

and dens other things being that

13. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US 6,974,526 B2) ("Lee") in view of Mathies et al. (US 6,623,613 B1) ("Mathies").

er and for is a farmer focusing (IEE) for publicary lamide got a consultation of APAGE, or

Addressing claim 12, Lee discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device, for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figures 2-9; col. 05:26-30; col. 01:25-37; col. 05:46-49; and col. 12:13-19.

Art Unit: 1753

Lee does not mention having the plurality of microchanels comprise different solid sieving materials. However, Lee does discloses that for a particularly microfluidic network the solid sieving material may be selected form a variety for sieving materials. See col. 06:60-62.

Mathies discloses providing a plurality of independent microfluidic networks on a substrate. See the abstract and Figure 4.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a plurality of microfluidic networks and thus microchannels as taught by Mathies in the invention of Lee because then a plurality of samples can be simultaneously analyzed.

It would have been further obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use different solid sieving materials in at least some of the plurality of microfluidic networks because this will help optimize the microfluidic networks for analyzing different samples.

al. les provious a promité of indépendent microfluidic networks on a

tions to been obeing to the with ordinary skill in the not of the time of the

14. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US 6,974,526 B2) ("Lee") in view of Mathies et al. (US 6,623,613 B1) ("Mathies") as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Heller (US 6,488,832 B2).

Lee as modified by Mathies does not disclose having the solid sieving materials

Art Unit: 1753

be of varying concentrations of at least one polymer between about 4% to about 20%(wt/vol).

Heller discloses, "Gradient gel electrophoresis is a technique in which a gel matrix having an increasing concentration of polyacrylamide (3% to 40%) along the separation axis is used to separate macromolecules in a wide range of sizes." See col. 02:53 - col. 03:55.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the solid sieving materials be of varying concentration as taught by Heller in the invention of Lee as modified by Mathies because this will optimize the separation conditions for the samples. For example, Heller discloses that DNA separation can be optimized with a solid sieving material of varying concentration. See col. 03:06-56. As for the concentration being between about 4% to about 20%, this is within the range disclosed by Heller and so barring a showing of unexpected results just further optimization of the sieving material for the expected sample types.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 15. Sanders et al. WO 02/48177 A10 ("Sanders") in view of Woudenberg et al. (US 6,660,147 B1) (Woudenberg") and Zhang et al. (US 6,464,850 B1) ("Zhang").

Sanders discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device (16), for isoelectric

and a have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the time time or me

and the could be no come within a viewing with the first as taught by

noment was an of hie sleving earners. In the expected the new con-

Art Unit: 1753

focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract and page 05, lines 04-24. Note that claims 1 and 2 do not actually require polyacrylamide gel only that the device be capable of holding such a gel, which the device of Sanders is since the microchannel contains a separation gel throughout its length. Note also the disclosure of SDS on page 6., first full paragraph.

Sanders does not mention how the sieving material is made, particularly whether UV-initiated polymerization is used or the photoinitiator of claim 11. As a first matter, the additional limitations of claims 9 and 11 are product-by-process limitations that do not structurally or compositionally differentiate the solid sieving material from that of Sanders without some showing by Applicants. In any event, as shown by Woudenberg a variety of sieving materials such as UV-initiated polymerized polyacrylamide were used as electrophoresis media in a microchannel (see the abstract and col. 08:35-60) and as shown by Zhang a variety of initiators, such as 2,2'-Azobis(2-amidinopropane) dihydrochloride were known at the time of the invention for making electrophoresis media (abstract and col. 11:33-65). So, barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the choice of gel, such as polyacrylamide from known electrophoresis media (sieving material) will just depend on the analyte and the separation conditions and the choice of how electrophoresis medium is made will depend on the electrophoresis medium chosen.

contract of the second materials with as 17V-initiated polymerized polyacrylamide were

i-sis media in a microchannel (see the absolute and 08:35-90)

and an other of the coard, a survey or initiators, such as 2,2%-Azobis(2-amidinoprepared

Art Unit: 1753

16. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiktorowicz et al. (US 6,214,191 B1) ('Wiktorowicz") in view of Woudenberg et al. (US 6,660,147 B1) (Woudenberg") and Zhang et al. (US 6,464,850 B1) ("Zhang").

Wiktorowicz discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device (100), for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figure 4; col. 06: 27-38; col. 07:25-30; col. 07:63-67; col. 09:58 – col. 10:08; and col. 13:66 – col. 14:34.

Wiktorowicz does not mention how the sieving material is made, particularly whether UV-initiated polymerization is used or the photoinitiator of claim 11, although Wiktorowicz does disclose a variety of possible sieving materials including polyacrylamide. See col. 13: 66 – col. 14:24. As a first matter, the additional limitations of claims 9 and 11 are product-by-process limitations that do not structurally or compositionally differentiate the solid sieving material from that of Wiktorowicz without some showing by Applicants. In any event, as shown by Woudenberg a variety of sieving materials such as UV-initiated polymerized polyacrylamide were used as electrophoresis media in a microchannel (see the abstract and col. 08:35-60) and as shown by Zhang a variety of initiators, such as 2,2-Azobis(2-amidinopropane) dihydrochloride were known at the time of the invention for making electrophoresis media (abstract and col. 11:33-65). So, barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the schoice of gel, such as polyacrylamide from known electrophoresis media (sieving material) will just depend on the analyte and the

or and a first eventuate the dollar marking male has both use of vinktorowicz without

and the second of the second o

separation conditions (Wiktorowicz col. 13:66 – col. 14:24) and the choice of how electrophoresis medium is made will depend on the electrophoresis medium chosen.

17. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manz et al. (US 5,599,432) ("Manz") in view of Woudenberg et al. (US 6,660,147 B1) (Woudenberg") and Zhang et al. (US 6,464,850 B1) ("Zhang").

Manz discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device (Figure 1), for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figure 1; col. 05:55-59; col. 05:13-27; col. 07:66 – col. 08:12; col. 09:33-54; col. 03:18-23; and col. 02:06-36.

Manz does not mention how the sieving material is made, particularly whether UV-initiated polymerization is used or the photoinitiator of claim 11, although Manz does disclose that a variety of sieving materials may be used including polyacrylamide. See col. 09:33–42; col. 06:12-25, and col. 02:06-18. As a first matter, the additional limitations of claims 9 and 11 are product-by-process limitations that do not structurally or compositionally differentiate the solid sieving material from that of Manz without some showing by Applicants. In any event, as shown by Woudenberg a variety of sieving materials such as UV-initiated polymerized polyacrylamide were used as electrophoresis media in a microchannel (see the abstract and col. 08:35-60) and as

2.1 2.12 - 4.17 3-5-1; col 00 10-11.0 2.4 col. 02:06-36

more than the not mention how the sleving material is made footscularly where a

1 Uv- 1 die 1970 en ation is un 3 5. The officer of claim 14 ulthough Manz does

shown by Zhang a variety of initiators, such as 2,2'-Azobis(2-amidinopropane) dihydrochloride were known at the time of the invention for making electrophoresis media (abstract and col. 11:33-65). So, barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the choice of gel, such as polyacrylamide from known electrophoresis media (sieving material) will just depend on the analyte and the separation conditions (Manz col. 09:40-46) and the choice of how electrophoresis medium is made will depend on the electrophoresis medium chosen.

18. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US 6,974,526 B2) ("Lee") in view of Woudenberg et al. (US 6,660,147 B1) (Woudenberg") and Zhang et al. (US 6,464,850 B1) ("Zhang").

and the Millianbert 10/04/2019

Lee discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device, for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figures 2-9; col. 05:26-30; col. 01:25-37; col. 05:46-49; and col. 12:13-19.

Lee does not mention how the sieving material is made, particularly whether UV-initiated polymerization is used or the photoinitiator of claim 11, although Lee does a variety of possible sieving materials including polyacrylamide. See col. 03:08-13 and claim 12. As a first matter, the additional limitations of claims 9 and 11 are product-by-

the nation of a multidinier side all form iphoreus devices.

Art Unit: 1753

process limitations that do not structurally or compositionally differentiate the solid sieving material from that of Lee without some showing by Applicants. In any event, as shown by Woudenberg a variety of sieving materials such as UV-initiated polymerized polyacrylamide were used as electrophoresis media in a microchannel (see the abstract and col. 08:35-60) and as shown by Zhang a variety of initiators, such as 2,2'-Azobis(2amidinopropane) dihydrochloride were known at the time of the invention for making electrophoresis media (abstract and col. 11:33-65). So, barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, the choice of gel, such as polyacrylamide from known electrophoresis media (sieving material) will just depend on the analyte and the separation conditions and the choice of how electrophoresis medium is made will depend on the electrophoresis medium chosen.

risk awn by the converts a called and simple materials such as UV-mittated polyniorized

a best of the control of the control

a mot of Lee without some snowing by Application only eyest mo

and tell or result and as shown by Enang a variety of initiators, such as 2.2'-Azobist2-

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manz et al. (US 5,599,432) ("Manz") in view of Heller (US 6,488,832 B2). Vidence to the

Manz discloses a multidimensional electrophoresis device (Figure 1), for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figure 1; col. 05:55-59; col. 05:13-27;

col. 07:66 - col. 08:12; col. 09:33-54; col. 03:18-23; and col. 02:06-36.

Manz also discloses providing different solid sieving materials. See claim 11 of Manz.

Manz does not disclose having the solid sieving materials be of varying concentrations of at least one polymer between about 4% to about 20%(wt/vol).

Heller discloses, "Gradient gel electrophoresis is a technique in which a gel matrix having an increasing concentration of polyacrylamide (3% to 40%) along the separation axis is used to separate macromolecules in a wide range of sizes." See col. 02:53 – col. 03:55.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the solid sieving materials be of varying concentration as taught by Heller in the invention of Manz because this will optimize the separation conditions for the samples. For example, Heller discloses that DNA separation can be optimized with a solid sieving material of varying concentration. See col. 03:06-56. As for the concentration being between about 4% to about 20%, this is within the range disclosed by Heller and so barring a showing of unexpected results just further optimization of the sieving material for the expected sample types.

the topped on the second to the first of the second to the second of the

There is not a been obvious to one with critically silk in the present the end to

20. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US 6,974,526 B2) ("Lee") in view of Mathies et al. (US 6,623,613 B1) ("Mathies") in view of Heller (US 6,488,832 B2).

and the surface insternal of varying concentration. She cold the 56 As for the

the course of a timbers as our second to recommend this is valid the range discussed

Lee as modified by Mathies does not disclose having the solid sieving materials be of varying concentrations of at least one polymer between about 4% to about 20%(wt/vol).

Heller discloses, "Gradient gel electrophoresis is a technique in which a gel matrix having an increasing concentration of polyacrylamide (3% to 40%) along the separation axis is used to separate macromolecules in a wide range of sizes." See col. 02:53 – col. 03:55.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the solid sieving materials be of varying concentration as taught by Heller in the invention of Lee as modified by Mathies because this will optimize the separation conditions for the samples. For example, Heller discloses that DNA separation can be optimized with a solid sieving material of varying concentration. See col. 03:06-56. As for the concentration being between about 4% to about 20%, this is within the range disclosed by Heller and so barring a showing of unexpected results just further optimization of the sieving material for the expected sample types.

and the separation in the same countries and the second section of the second section is a second section of the second section of the second section is a second section of the section of the second section of the se

as wealth into buen of the refer with ordinary skill in the accounted time of the

and the second of the second o

21. Claim 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US 6,974,526 B2) ("Lee") in view of Andersson et al. (US 6,812,456 B2) ("Andersson").

that the first angle of schosed by Hemmi and no burning a university of the specied results just

大学的病理。斯·伊克尔斯·奥克特、斯·维克特等的基本。第二次是20%/由海克马

or the sieving materia for the expected samely or a

Art Unit: 1753

Lee discloses a kit comprising multidimensional electrophoresis device, for isoelectric focusing (IEF), or polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), or both of a fluid sample, comprising at least one microchannel having a length and a solid sieving material. See the abstract; Figures 2-9; col. 05:26-30; col. 01:25-37; col. 05:46-49; and col. 12:13-19.

Lee also discloses including in the kit at least one reagent necessary for conducting IEF of PAGE separations. See col. 05:45-49 and col. 06:13-20.

Lee does not mention injecting the fluid sample into the multidimensional device.

Andersson discloses a kit comprising multidimensional microfluidic device for analyzing fluid and means for injecting the fluid sample into the multidimensional device. See the abstract and col. 20:36-46. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include in the kit of Lee the means for injecting fluid sample as taught by Andersson because then the sample and reagents can be automatically and accurately injected in the device.

Communities 1 12 / 31. Separation of 1 col. 05:45-49 and col. 06:13-20

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEX NOGUEROLA whose telephone number is (571) 272-1343. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

When the make a multiput, 20th certiling a sould have been obvious to one with ordinary

enter the error of the time than the completend reagents can be automatically and

The second of the second of the second of the second

and the similar time device.

Application/Control Number: 10/646,808 Page 28

Art Unit: 1753

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, NAM NGUYEN can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

an application or proceeding is as in the 571.07 in the

en le Commanda de la Commanda Parvache de la College Parre. Su la College de la Colleg

The state of the state through Private PAIR only the more information and countries for a

To a Normal Control of the Control o

which has been a significant to the same of the factor

rothe de la la fordissa de la la fordissa de la contrata Minai. Estable

Alex Noguerola

Primary Examiner

AU 1753

November 4, 2006